UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/626,208 | 07/24/2003 | John Favazza | 063170.6567(20000432) | 9671 |

5073        7590        04/09/2008
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 600
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| GELAGAY, SHEWAYE |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2137 | |

| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 04/09/2008 | ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 January 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.       2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5-8 and 24-36* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 3, 5-8 24-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

# DETAILED ACTION

1.      This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on January 3, 2008.

Claims 1, 2 and 32 have been amended.  New claim 36 is added. Claims 1, 3, 5-8 24-36 are

pending.

### *Response to Arguments*

2.      Applicant's arguments filed January 3, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. In response to applicants arguments the following comments are made:

The applicant argued that neither Flurry nor Mishra, alone or in combination, disclose

teach, or suggest each of the limitations in claim 1. The applicant further argued that in Flurry,

the alleged "agent" generates the alleged "session-ticket ID" and therefore, the alleged "agent"

does not intercept the session ticket ID as required by claim 1. The examiner respectfully

disagrees. Flurry discloses the user directs a browser application to a web page that is available

from the ASP aggregator service, which causes a web page request to be sent to the ASP

aggregator service in an HTTP request message. The ASP aggregator determines that the client

has not yet been authenticated and generates an authentication challenge page, i.e. login page,

after which the logon page is sent to the client. The user then enters authentication data, after the

ASP aggregator service has authenticated the user, the ASP aggregator service generates an

aggregator token. The client automatically stores the aggregator token and subsequently sent

along with request from the client. An application request message is returned to the ASP

aggregator, which then determines the selected application from the request. (page 7, pp. 70-75)

A client device interacts with server 504 that supports an ASP or an aggregated application, in response to user actions, an application can generate response, and the requests and responses are depicted as communication traffic. During the initial authentication process, an aggregator token would be stored at the client and then subsequently sent along with requests from the client when appropriate. At some later point in time, the user's session will expire, the user may attempt to access an aggregated application using a bookmarked URL, which causes the user's browser application to send a request to the specified URL (i.e. application request with Aggregator Token), and the aggregator token is automatically sent along, with the request. After the aggregated application receives the request, it will determine that the request is not accompanied by a valid application authentication token. Rather than return an error to the user, the aggregator token is examined at the ASP aggregator service. (page 8, pp.76-80) In addition Mishra teaches an ASP aggregator that provides its users with seamless access to all the ASP's as part of its trusted relationship. (page 7-8; 3. S2ML UseCase Scenarios)

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.    Claims 1, 3, 5-8 and 24-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Flurry et al. U.S. Publication Number 2003/0061512 (hereinafter Flurry) in view of Mishra

et al.("Security Services Markup Language", January 8, 2001 (hereinafter Mishra)

[Note: "XML Key Management Specification (XKMS)", W3C Note 30, March 2001, pages 28-

45, is used to further elaborate on the teaching of XML signature and HMAC taught by Mishra

reference]

As per claims 1, 7, 26 and 32:

Flurry teaches a method comprising intercepting at an agent a web service

customer access to a first web service, the agent residing between the web service

customer and the first web service and between the web service customer and a

second web service; (page 7, paragraph 70; ASP Aggregator service 404) collecting at

the agent one or more credentials of the web service customer; (page 7, paragraph 71;

The ASP Aggregator generates an authentication challenge, i.e., logon page...)

determining at the agent whether the web service customer is authenticated and

authorized; (Page 7, paragraph 72; ASP Aggregator service has authenticated the user)

if the web service customer is authenticated and authorized, at the agent: granting the

first request; initiating creation of a session and a session ticket; obtaining a session

ticket ID for the session ticket; (page 7, paragraphs 73-75; after the ASP aggregator

service has authenticated the user...the ASP aggregator then generates an application

authentication token that is appropriate for the user and the selected application. The

client's request is modified to include the application authentication token...and directed

to a specific URL) intercepting a second request to grant the web service customer

access to the second web service, the second request comprising the assertion and a

private key; (page 5, paragraph 54- page 6, paragraph 60; ASP aggregator may use a

variety of security technique... message authentication code (MAC), ...PKCS; page 9,

paragraphs 88-90; since the client has been previously authenticated ...the ASP

aggregator would immediately generate the application authentication token that is

needed with respect to the second aggregated application. After the second aggregated

application is received and verified, the user may interact with the second aggregated

application) and if the private key matches the public key in the assertion, grant the

second request without reauthenticating or reauthorizing the web service customer.

(page 9, paragraphs 88-90; since the client has been previously authenticated ...the

ASP aggregator would immediately generate the application authentication token that is

needed with respect to the second aggregated application. After the second aggregated

application is received and verified, the user may interact with the second aggregated

application) Flurry does not explicitly disclose encrypting the session ticket ID and a

public key into an assertion and matching a private key with the public key in the

assertion. Mishra in analogues art, however, discloses encrypting the session ticket ID

and a public key into an assertion and matching a private key with the public key in the

assertion. (page 11, 4. Architecture; ...assertions must e signed using the framework

described in the [XML-SIG] specification...supports both using secret-key (for example,

HMAC) and public-key signing; page 31 MIME Binding) Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the

method disclosed by Flurry with Mishra in order to provide security services for

assertions the may travel across the Internet and be scrutinized and checked for validity far from the point of origin. (page 11; Mishra)

As per claims 3, 8 and 27:

The combination of Flurry and Mishra teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Flurry further discloses a method wherein the assertion comprises a Security Assertions Markup Language (SAML) assertion. (page 3, paragraph 34)

As per claims 5 and 28:

The combination of Flurry and Mishra teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Flurry further a method wherein the agent comprises an Extensible Markup Language (XML) agent. (page 3, paragraph 34)

As per claims 6 and 29:

The combination of Flurry and Mishra teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Flurry further a method wherein the procssors are further operable to determine whether the web service customer is authenticated and authorized comprises comparing the web service customer with a database containing authentication and authorization data. (page 7, paragraph 72)

As per claims 24 and 30:

The combination of Flurry and Mishra teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Flurry further a method wherein the first request and the second request both originate at the web service customer; and

the method further comprising communicating the assertion to the web service customer to enable the web service customer to access the second web service without reauthentication or

reauthorization after the web service customer accesses the first web service. (page 7, paragraph 71; page 9, paragraphs 88-90)

As per claims 25, 31 and 35:

The combination of Mishra and Hallam-Baker teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Flurry further discloses a method wherein the first request originates at the web service customer and the second request originates at the first web service; and the method further comprising communicating the assertion to the first web service to enable the web service customer to access the second web service without reauthentication or reauthorization after the web service customer accesses the first web service. (page 7, paragraph 71; page 9, paragraphs 88-90)

As per claim 33:

The combination of Mishra and Hallam-Baker teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Mishra further discloses a method comprising at the agent, placing the assertion into a header; sending the assertion to the first web service; returning the assertion to the web service consumer. (page 7, 3 S2ML Use Case Senarios; assertions can travel with the user in various ways...http headers)

As per claim 34:

The combination of Mishra and Hallam-Baker teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Mishra further discloses a method wherein the second request comprises an XML document containing the assertion; and  wherein the web service customer has signed the XML document with the private key. (page 11, 4. Architecture)

3.      Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flurry et al. U.S.

Publication Number 2003/0061512 (hereinafter Flurry) in view of Mishra et al.("Security

Services Markup Language", January 8, 2001 (hereinafter Mishra) in view of Woods et al.

(hereinafter Woods) US 6,609,198.

The combination of Mishra and Hallam-Baker teaches all the subject matter as

discussed above. Both references do not explicitly disclose that wherein the second

request is intercepted at the agent before the second web service. (col. 7, line 36-col. 9,

line 51) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time

invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Flurry and Mishra with Woods in

order to provide a single sign-on for multiple information resources. (Abstract; Woods)


*Conclusion*

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**  Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.  In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action.  In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHEWAYE GELAGAY whose telephone number is (571)272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shewaye Gelagay
/S. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 2137

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2137